### **REMARKS**

## **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 4-17 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 2, 7, and 9-11 are rejected.

Claims 3-6, 8, and 12-15 are objected to.

Claims 3 and 18-26 have been canceled, without prejudice.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8, 9 and 12 have been amended.

Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims, and drawings, as originally filed.

# Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7, and 9-11 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 7, and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,158,910 to Hanas et al. (hereafter "Hanas '910").

Without admitting or denying whether or not Hanas '910 anticipates or renders objected claims 1, 2, 7 and 9-15 unpatentable, Applicant has elected to amend claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of objected to dependent claim 3. At this time Applicant believes that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance; furthermore, rejected claims 2, 7 and 9-11 which depend either directly or indirectly upon independent claim 1 would also be allowable by virtue of their dependency. Removal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7 and 9-15 is respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Matter**

The Office Action states that claims 3-6, 8, and 12-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for indicating that the above dependent claims would be allowable. At this time Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of dependent claim 3, therefore, Applicant believes that claim 1 and all of the claims that depend therefrom are in allowable form. Furthermore, Applicant has amended claim 8 to be an independent claim which includes all the limitations of its underlying base claims; therefore, Applicant believes that claim 8 as well as all of claims dependent thereupon are in condition for allowance. Additionally, Applicant has amended claim 12 to include all of the limitations of claim 1 from which it depends. At this time Applicant believes that claims 12-15 are in condition for allowance. Applicant notes that claims 16-17 were previously withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected species, however, Applicant maintains that independent claim 1 is now an allowable generic claim, therefore, Applicant respectfully request allowance of these claims by virtue of the fact that a generic claim has been allowed.

## CONCLUSION

With regard to the remaining withdrawn claims 18-26, Applicant, for the purpose of moving this case to allowance has canceled these claims. It is respectfully submitted that in view of the above amendments and remarks the claims 1, 2 and 4-17, as amended, are patentably distinguishable because the cited patents, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or render obvious, the present invention.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the pending claims are properly allowable, which allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney at (248) 364-4300 if any unresolved matters remain.

Respectfully submitted,

WARN PARTNERS, P.C. Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Gregory L O

Reg. No. 53425

P.O. Box 70098 Rochester Hills, MI 48307 (248) 364-4300

Dated: November 8,2007

GLO:slm